

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19-20, 22, 31-32, 34-47, 49-50 and 52 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. In the present amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19-20, 22, 31-32, 34-47, 49-50 and 52 have been canceled, and new claims 61-80 added. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendments, claims 61-80 will be currently pending, of which claims 61 and 71 are independent. Claims 62-70 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claims 61. Claims 72-80 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claims 71. Applicants submit that claims 61-80 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to allow the claims in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**I. Claim 1, 2, 4-17, 19-20, 22, 31-32, 34-47, 49-50 and 52 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19-20, 22, 31-32, 34-47, 49-50 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0097179 to Orme (“Orme”). Applicants hereby cancels claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19-20, 22, 31-32, 34-47, 49-50 and 52, mooted the rejections to these claims.

PATENTABILITY OF NEW CLAIMS

II. New Independent Claims 61 and 71 Patentable Over Orme

New independent claims 61 and 71 recite, in pertinent part:

a device intermediary between a server and at least one client operated by a user, allocating a plurality of network identifiers to the user, selecting a first network identifier to assign to a first RDP session, selecting a second network identifier different from the first network identifier to assign to a second RDP session, receiving, via a port of the device, a first network communication received from the server, identifying the first network identifier in the first network communication, communicating the first network communication to the first client of the first RDP session responsive to the identification of the first network identifier, receiving via the same port a second network communication received from the server, identifying the second network identifier in the second network communication and communicating the second network communication to the second client of the second RDP session responsive to the identification of the second network identifier.

Orme merely describes assigning IP addresses to programs executing on a computer, and fails to disclose an intermediary device establishing a user's RDP sessions between a server and respective clients, and assigning unique network identifiers to each RDP session for directing messages of the RDP sessions received via the same port of the device to the appropriate clients. Accordingly, Orme fails to disclose each and every feature of claims 61 and 71. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 61 and 71, and dependent claims 62-70 and 72-80, are patentable and in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' representative would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' representative at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

FOLEY & LARDNER, LLP

Dated: January 14, 2010

/Paul M. H. Pua/

Paul M. H. Pua

Registration No. 63,167

Foley & Lardner, LLP
111 Huntington Avenue, Suite 2600
Boston, MA 02199
(617) 502-3267